

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

Computer Security Legislation

FROM:

[Redacted]

EXTENSION

NO.

C/ISSD/OS

DATE

10 FEB 1986

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. C/PPG/OS

Attn: [Redacted]

2/12

ES

2.

AC/PPG

3.

EO/OS

4.

EB

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

FYI - I would like to be advised of how we fit into the loop, if at all.

2-1

It looks like OLC asked for our and C/CSO's comments re OLC's draft letter to Congressman Mac Curley by 3 Feb 86. We're yet asked (or know about) submitting a response?

Attached in subject file, I pulled from Registry. What's done is done.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CONFIDENTIAL

10 FEB 1986

MEMORANDUM FOR:

[redacted]
Legislation Division, OCA

FROM:

[redacted]
Information Systems Security Division, OS

SUBJECT:

Computer Security Legislation [redacted]

REFERENCE:

Memo for C/CSG/OIT and DD/P&M/OS fm LD/OLL, dtd
29 Jan 86, Same Subject, OLL-86-0266

25X1

25X1

25X1

1. I appreciate your incorporation of my concerns in your letter to Congressman Dave McCurdy. Your comments adequately sum up our concerns. The only comment I have is, in Paragraph 4 of memorandum, you could have mentioned the problem of aggregation. That is, the number of security plans submitted to NSA, NBS, and GSA over a period of time could, in fact, become classified and extremely revealing as to the way the Agency conducts business.

25X1

2. Again, I think your letter is very good and covers our concerns. The above comment is made only as a suggestion.

25X1
25X1

25X1

CONFIDENTIAL